

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-57 are pending in this application.

Applicant's undersigned representative appreciates the Examiner's courtesy extended during the telephonic interview conducted on September 12, 2005. Applicant's undersigned representative concurs with the substance of the interview set forth in the Interview Summary mailed on September 19, 2005.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 9, 19, 20, 28-30, 34, 42-47, 51, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiegley* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,711,677 B1) in view of *Chan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,378,070 B1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the *Wiegley* reference in view of the *Chan et al.* reference does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claims 1, 28, and 51.

Claim 1 defines a print system that includes a content server, a plurality of printers connectable to the content server via a network, and a client computer connectable to the content server via the network. The content server includes a content database which collects a plurality of kinds of content original data, a reader which reads content original data which is selected by the client computer as content data from the content database, and a printer specifying information requester which transmits a request for transmission of printer specifying information from the content server to a printer which is selected by the client computer. The printer specifying information includes a printer identifier to specify the printer.

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner asserts that personal computer 12 shown in Figure 2 of the *Wiegley* reference constitutes a content server as in the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of the *Wiegley* reference relative to the claimed subject matter. The personal computer 12 shown in

Figure 2 of the *Wiegley* reference is configured to function as a client computer rather than a server computer. In this regard, Applicant notes that personal computer 12 is provided with printer driver 18, which is coupled to network 14 and user application 16. With the configuration shown in Figure 2, it is not possible for personal computer 12 to provide services for other computers connected to network 14. As such, any other computer connected to network 14 would require its own printer driver to use printer 10. Thus, the *Wiegley* reference does not support the Examiner's assertion that personal computer 12 is a content server as in the claimed subject matter.

Further, as specified in claim 1, the content server has a content database, which collects a plurality of kinds of content original data, and a reader, which reads content original data which is selected by the client computer as content data from the content database. As personal computer 12 is not a content server, personal computer 12 does not have a plurality of kinds of content original data in a content database. Moreover, personal computer 12 does not have a reader *which reads content original data selected by a client computer* because 1) the *Wiegley* reference does not have a client computer as in the claimed subject matter, and 2) the computer 100 shown in the *Chan et al.* reference does not select content original data (the *Chan et al.* reference discloses only computer 100, print server 130, and printer 140 connected by a network).

The content server also has a printer specifying information requester and the printer has a printer specifying information transmitter. The printer specifying information requester transmits a request for transmission of printer specifying information from the content server to a printer which is selected by the client computer. The printer specifying information transmitter transmits the printer specifying information, which includes a printer identifier, from the printer to the content server based on the request from the printer specifying information requester. The personal computer 12 shown in the *Wiegley* reference does not

have the claimed printer specifying information requester and the printer 10 shown in the *Wiegley* reference does not have the claimed printer specifying information transmitter because the session identifier shown in the *Wiegley* reference is merely an identifier for identifying the *print session* between computer 12 and printer 10 (see column 3, line 66, to column 4, line 1). The session identifier shown by *Wiegley* is not an identifier for specifying the printer and, therefore, the session identifier is different from the printer specifying information of the claimed subject matter.

Finally, as specified in claim 1, the printer has a judging portion which reads the printer identifier included in the printer specifying information of the print job data and judges whether the printer identifier coincides with its own printer identifier, and a print executor which executes print of the print job data in the printer only when the judging portion judges that the printer identifier included in the print job data coincides with its own printer identifier. In the *Wiegley* reference, the printer 10 does not have its own printer identifier because the session identifier does not constitute a printer identifier as in the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the printer 10 does not have either the judging portion or the print executor specified in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of the *Wiegley* and *Chan et al.* references would not have resulted in a print system having all of the features specified in claim 1. As such, the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Chan et al.* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter specified in claim 1.

Regarding independent claims 28 and 51, these claims define features of a printer and a content server, respectively, suitable for use in the print system defined in claim 1. The patentability arguments set forth above regarding claim 1 also apply to claims 28 and 51.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 28, and 51 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Chan et al.* Claims 2, 3, 9, 19,

and 20, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, claims 29, 30, 34, and 42-47, each of which ultimately depends from claim 28, and claim 57, which depends from claim 51, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Chan et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4-8, 10-18, 21-27, 31-33, 35-41, 48-50, and 52-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Wiegley* and *Chan et al.* further in view of *Venkatesan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,801,999 B1). Each of claims 4-8, 10-18, and 21-27 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, each of claims 31-33, 35-41, and 48-50 ultimately depends from independent claim 28, and each of claims 52-56 ultimately depends from independent claim 51. The *Venkatesan et al.* reference does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of the combination of the *Wiegley* and *Chan et al.* references relative to independent claims 1, 28, and 51. As such, the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Chan et al.* and *Venkatesan et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 28, and 51. Accordingly, claims 4-8, 10-18, 21-27, 31-33, 35-41, 48-50, and 52-56 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Chan et al.* and *Venkatesan et al.* for at least the reason that they depend from one of independent claims 1, 28, and 51.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-57, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of

**Application No. 09/938,516**  
**Request for Reconsideration dated February 28, 2006**  
**Response to Office Action mailed November 29, 2005**

this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. KYWAP007).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
**Customer Number 25920**